

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 1 to further clarify the invention. Entry and consideration are respectfully requested in view of the RCE accompanying this Amendment.

I. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

II. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,420,883 to Swensen et al. (hereinafter “Swensen”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0147532 to Hakkarainen et al. (hereafter “Hakkarainen”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Of these rejected claims, only claim 1 is independent. Independent claim 1 *inter alia* recites: “said messages received in a same observation time window  $F_n$  containing  $t_n$  with a width of  $T_F$  are decoded using a decoding sequence  $DC_n$  adapted to decode said dynamic code  $C_n$ , regardless of an unsuccessful decoding of the previous message  $M_{n-1}$ .”

In an exemplary, non-limiting embodiment of the present invention, a method for safely receiving and selecting in an observation time window the message that corresponds to the last one sent is provided. Specifically, the message received by the receiving platform are processed as a function of their reception date  $t_r$  based on a clock specific to this receiving platform so that the messages received successively in the same observation time window  $F_n$  containing  $t_n$  with a width  $\Delta T_F$  are decoded using a decoding sequence  $DC_n$  adapted to decode the dynamic code  $C_n$ .

In an exemplary embodiment, a receiving platform processes (as a function of the reception date  $t_r$  based on a clock specific to receiving platform) received messages. The messages received in a same observation time window  $F_n$ , containing  $t_r$ , with a width of  $\Delta T_F$  are decoded using a decoding sequence  $DC_n$  adapted to decode said dynamic code  $C_n$  regardless of an unsuccessful decoding of the previous message  $M_n$ . Accordingly, the messages are received and the message which has been the last one sent is selected in an observation time window. It will be appreciated that the foregoing remarks relate to the invention in a general sense, the remarks are not necessarily limitative of any claims and are intended only to help the Examiner better understand the distinguishing aspects of claim 1 mentioned above.

The Examiner acknowledges that Swensen does not disclose or suggest the above-quoted unique features of claim 1 (*see* pages 3-4 and 7 of the Office Action). That is, Swensen does not disclose or even remotely suggests messages received in a same observation time window being decoded using a decoding sequence  $DC_n$  adapted to decode said dynamic code  $C_n$  regardless of an unsuccessful decoding of the previous message  $M$ . Hakkarainen does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Swensen.

Hakkarainen discloses microperiod messages where each microperiod message contains the deciphering key of the following or subsequent microperiod message to be received (§ 18). Thus, the decoding of the message by using DC is only possible in Hakkarainen if the message sent previously has been correctly decoded including the deciphering key DC. In Hakkarainen, in case of an unsuccessful reception of the deciphering key DC, a bidirectional link is required (§ 22).

Hakkarainen, however, does not disclose or suggest that the bidirectional link is not required *e.g.*, as described in an exemplary embodiment on page 13 line to page 14 line 9 of the specification. In Hakkarainen, the two messages  $M_{n-1}$  and  $M_n$  that are successfully received can be correctly decoded in the time window  $F_n$ . Hakkarainen does not disclose or suggest disallowing this type of decoding. That is, Hakkarainen does not disclose or suggest that when the previous messages  $M_{n-1}$  is expected to be received in  $F_{n-1}$  but is instead received in  $F_n$ , it is discarded. In other words, Hakkarainen does not disclose or suggest decoding the received message using the decoding sequence DC regardless of an unsuccessful decoding of the previous message. In short, Hakkarainen does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Swensen.

For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Swensen in view of Hakkarainen. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-8.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Application No.: 10/677,273

Attorney Docket No.: Q77862

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nataliya Dvorson  
Registration No. 56,616

Date: October 8, 2008